

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL D. MCCROY,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

8:09CR272

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the court on defendant Michael D. McCroy's objection, Filing No. [113](#), to the magistrate judge's findings and recommendation, Filing No. [105](#). The government charged McCroy with conspiracy to commit bank robbery in Count I, bank robbery in Count II, and brandishing a firearm during a bank robbery in Count III. Defendant filed a motion requesting that he be allowed to file pretrial motions out of time and to dismiss the indictment or, in the alternative, for election of remedies. Filing No. [102](#) and Filing No. [103](#). The magistrate judge reviewed the motion and determined that it should be denied. McCroy objects to these findings of the magistrate judge. The magistrate judge's finding may be reversed if clearly erroneous or contrary to law. See [28 U.S.C. § 636](#). The court has reviewed the record and relevant law. The court finds no showing of good cause for the delay. See Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(e). The court concludes that the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge should be adopted in their entirety.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's motion to file pretrial motions out of time, Filing No. [102](#), is denied.
2. Defendant's motion to dismiss indictment or in the alternative elect remedies, Filing No. [103](#), is denied.
3. Defendant's objections, Filing No. [113](#), are overruled.
4. The order of the magistrate judge, Filing No. [105](#), is adopted in its entirety.

DATED this 26th day of February, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
Chief United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.